

REMARKS

Claims 43, 47, 51, and 52 were amended. New dependent claims 53-56 have been added. Claims 43-56 are pending in this application.

Claims 43-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Salmonsens (U.S. Patent No. 7,178,169).

Amended independent claim 43 recites, in relevant part, the following:

the first identification information identifying at least one of the first information processing apparatus or a user of the first information processing apparatus, the second identification information identifying a program stored on a recording medium coupled to the first information processing apparatus, the second information processing apparatus being operable to verify whether the received first and second identification information and the password match data stored in the database, such that when the first identification information does not match the data stored in the database, and when the second identification information matches the data stored in the database and a password inputted by the user at the first information processing apparatus is valid, the second information processing apparatus permits the first information processing apparatus to execute the program

(Emphasis added). Accordingly, in a network system of claim 43, a user of a first information processing apparatus may select a way to obtain authorization to execute a program stored on a recording medium. When first identification information, which identifies at least one of the first information processing apparatus or the user, does not match data stored in a database of a second information processing apparatus, and when second identification information, which identifies the program on the medium, matches the data stored in the database and a password inputted by the user at the first information apparatus is valid, the second information processing apparatus permits the first information processing apparatus to execute the program.

The applied portions of Salmonsens appear to disclose a secure server only providing access to digital content on a disk, using a disk ID which was retrieved from the disk and a user identification provided by a user. Nowhere do the applied portions of Salmonsens appear to disclose that, even when first identification information, which identifies at least one of a first information processing apparatus (a device on which the disk is loaded) or the user, does not match the data stored in the database (of the secure server), when second identification information (the disk ID) matches the data stored in the database and the password inputted by the user is valid, execution of the program on the disk is permitted. Thus, Salmonsens does not appear to disclose or suggest that when the first identification information does not match the data stored in the database, and when the second identification information matches the data stored in the database and a password inputted by the user is valid, a program stored on a recording medium is permitted to be executed, as required by claim 43.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 43 is patentable over Salmonsens.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 43, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 47, 51 and 52, which include limitations corresponding to those of claim 43 discussed above, are distinguishable from Salmonsens as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 44-46 and 48-50, and new claims 53-56, which recite that execution of the program is permitted when each of the first and second identification information matches the data stored in the database, depend from one of the independent claims. As a result, claims 44-46, 48-50 and 53-56 are distinguishable from Salmonsens as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described regarding claim 43, and

because of the additional restrictions they require.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Davy E. Zoneranch

Registration No.: 37,267

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants